Remarks

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed September 19, 2006 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1-21 and 28-33. Claims 1, 3, 11, 16-21, and 28 have been amended. Claims 22-27 have been canceled. New claims 33 has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 11, 17 and 28 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 23 has been cancelled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 22-27 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter in that the system claimed is comprised by data structures. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The M.P.E.P. §2106.01 I. recites:

> "Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable
> media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because
> they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer...
> In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a
> data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships
> between the data structure and the computer software and hardware
> components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized,
> and is thus statutory."

Claim 16 has been amended to recite a processor and that the data structure, in each case, is operable on the processor to perform the particular function recited. Claims 17-21 have also

been amended to recite that the data structures in each claim is operable on the processor to perform the associated function. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the functional interrelationship between the data structure and the computer hardware components or processor permit the data structures functionality to be realized as provided in M.P.E.P. §2106.01. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-21 as amended recite statutory subject matter under M.P.E.P. §2106.01 I., and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 16-21 is respectfully solicited.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 16, 19, 20, 22, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Vale (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0116528; hereinafter "Vale"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Vale in paragraph [0030] recites:

> "In one embodiment, the present invention attempts to aid a user in
> entering text, such as a URL, into a hand-held device by matching the
> entered text to previously visited URLs in displaying these URLs in a list."

And in paragraph [0035], Vale recites:

> "4. The browser automatically matches the text that has been entered
> to any previously viewed URLs in the browser's history, cache, or
> recently entered addresses and provides any matches to the user in a list,
> allowing the user to select one of the items and browse to it as the desired URL."

In contrast, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> "loading a URL a personal data book collection object in response to receiving the
> results of a network search by a search engine; and
>   identifying any matches between results from the search and any URL object
> references of previously visited URLs in the URL personal data book collection object."

Thus, Vale teaches aiding a user in completing a URL address in an address field 205 of an Internet browser as clearly shown in Figure 2 of Vale. Vale does not teach or suggest loading a URL personal data book collection object in response to receiving the results of a network

search by a search engine nor does Vale teach or suggest identifying any matches between results from the search and any URL object references of previously visited URLs in the URL personal databook collection. Additionally, Vale does not teach or suggest a URL personal data book collection object and URL object references that may be contained in the URL personal data book collection object as recited in claim 1 and as defined in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Vale, claim 16 has been amended to recite similar features to independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is also patentably distinguishable over Vale for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of claim 16 is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2 and 6-9 these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Vale. As previously discussed, Vale does not teach or suggest an URL personal data book collection object and URL object references contained in the URL personal data book collection object. Vale merely teaches providing a listing of previously viewed URL matches in a browser's history, cache or recently entered addresses. There is no teaching or suggestion in Vale of conducting a search by a search engine and then selecting any results from the search containing content of interest for future reference in a URL personal data book collection object or storing the results as a URL reference in the URL personal data book collection object as a serialized object as provided in claims 2 and 6-9 of the application.

Additionally, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Because of this dependency, these claims contain all of the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 6-9 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Vale, these claims recited similar features to claims 6 and 7. Additionally, claims

19 and 20 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 16, and by virtue of that dependency, contain all of the features of claim 16. Accordingly, claims 19 and 20 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of claims 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 17, 23, 28, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the rejection of claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale, as previously discussed, Vale merely teaches presenting possible choices for selection by a user of a URL partially entered by the user in an address field 205 of an Internet browser as indicated in Figure 2 of Vale. As previously discussed, Vale does not teach or suggest receiving the results of a network search by a search engine. Additionally, there is no need in Vale to visually identify any matches in the results from the search as provided by the embodiment of the present invention recited in each of claims 3 and 17 because Vale only displays URLs that were previously visited and are therefore in the browser's history or cache. In contrast, an embodiment of the present invention as recited in the claims performs a network search and presents all of the results of that search. Not all of the search results may have been previously visited or stored by the user as URL object references in the URL personal databook collection object. Therefore, there would be no matches between these search results and URL object references of previously visited URLs. Accordingly, a feature of an embodiment of the present invention as recited in claims 3 and 17 is to visually identify any matches between the search results and any URL object references in the URL personal data book collection object to permit the user to easily identify these matches to previously visited URLs from other URLs in the search results. Vale merely displays all previously visited URLs in the browser history or cache and there is no need to visually identify the URLs because all of the URLs displayed in Vale have been previously visited. Accordingly, visually identifying matches between results from the search and any URL object references would not be obvious in view of Vale and Applicant respectfully requests that a proper reference for such teaching be cited.

Additionally, claim 3 depends either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and claim 17 depends either directly or indirectly from independent claim 16. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 3 and 17 contain all of the features of independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. As previously discussed, claims 1 and 16 as amended are patentably distinguishable over Vale. Therefore, claims 3 and 17 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claims 3 and 17 is respectfully solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale, claim 4 recites "visually identifying any matches by at least one of a predetermined icon, a predetermined text font and highlighting". As previously discussed, Vale does not teach or suggest visually identifying matches with previously visited URLs because Vale does not teach or suggest doing a network search and Vale only presents previously visited URLs and there is no need to distinguish between previously visited URLs and URLs that have not been previously visited in the search results. Therefore claim 4 would not be obvious in view of Vale. Additionally, claim 4 depends from claim 3 which depends from claim 1. Because of this dependency, claim 4 contains all of the features of claim 3 and claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is also submitted to be patentable over Vale and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of independent claims 11 and 28, as previously discussed, Vale has no need to visually identify any matches between a URL entered in a browser address field and previously visited URLs because Vale automatically presents all previously visited URLs and Vale does not teach or suggest comparing results from a network search by a search engine to any URL object references of previously visited URLs as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in each of independent claims 11 and 28. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 11 and 28 are each patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claims 11 and 28 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of claim 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Vale, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Vale.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Vale of loading the URL personal data book collection object in response to presenting the results from the search as recited in claim 12 because Vale does not teach or suggest performing a search by a search engine. Vale also does not teach or suggest selecting any results from the search containing content of interest for future reference in response to no matches and storing any selected search results in the URL personal databook collection object as provided by claim 14. Additionally, claims 12 and 14 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 11, and by virtue of this dependency, contain all of the features of claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claims 12 and 14 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale, as previously discussed, it would not be obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to visually identify the matches generated by Vale's method because Vale presents all URLs in the browser's cache and Vale does not teach or suggest performing a search in which some of the search results may not be in a URL personal data book collection object as provided by an embodiment of the present invention as recited in the claims. Additionally, claims 29 and 31 recite features which are not taught or suggested by Vale. Vale does not teach or suggest loading a URL personal data book collection object in response to presenting the results from the search as recited in claim 29 nor does Vale teach or suggest selecting any results from the search containing content of interest for future reference in response to no matches and storing any selected search results in the URL personal databook collection object as recited in claim 31. Furthermore, claims 29 and 31 depend directly from independent claim 28. Because of this dependency, claims 29 and 31 contain all of the features of claim 28. Accordingly, claims 29 and 31 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claims 29 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0044800; hereinafter "Han"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Han teaches an Internet organizer where registrants of websites can register URLs by specifying the URL and associated descriptors. The URLs and descriptors and/or metadata form a URL database (Abstract of Han). Han on page 8, paragraph [0074] recites:

"Referring now to FIG. 12B, there is an illustrative block diagram indicating a process 170 to be performed when a user or other visitor to Web Organizer webpage enters a search term(s) in the key word entry box 130 (FIG. 9) and selects the Search button 128. The illustrated systems, upon accepting the search term(s) 172, creates keyword associations with the search term 174 by extracting information from the Knowledge Database 102 of FIG. 8, otherwise known as reciprocal 2-stage memory."

And Han in paragraph [0077] recites:

"Returning now to FIG. 12B, once the keyword associations are identified 174, the URL Database 104 can be searched according to the search term(s) and the keyword associations 176 to determine subcategories and cross-categories of the search term. In an embodiment, the keyword associations from the Knowledge Database 102 can be understood to be additional search terms for searching the URL database 104."

Accordingly, the Knowledge Database of Han is merely providing additional search terms for the URL database and Han does not teach or suggest presenting saved or captured comments associated with any matches and the results of a search. Han is merely providing additional search terms as indicated above from the recitations from Han.

As previously discussed, Vale teaches a method for text entry in an electronic device wherein the method attempts to aid a user in entering text into a hand-held device by matching the entered text to previously visited URLs and displaying these URLs in a list as shown in Figure 2 of Vale. Vale is merely suggesting a way to complete the URL being entered into the address field 205 in Figure 2 and Vale does not teach or suggest providing additional search terms as taught by Han. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Han with Vale, and even if appropriate do so, Han and Vale still would not provide the present invention as recited in the claims of the present application.

Claim 5 recites "presenting any saved or captured comments associated with any matches in response to positioning a computer positioning device on a selected visually identified match

in the results from the search." Applicant respectfully submits that neither Vale nor Han teach or suggest presenting any saved or captured comments associated with any matches in the results of a search by a search engine as provided by claim 5. Additionally, claim 5 depends indirectly from claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, claim 5 contains all of the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Han adds nothing to the teachings of Vale so as to render claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, claim 5 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 5 is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han, as previously discussed there is no motivation to combine Han with Vale and such combination would be improper under M.P.E.P. §706.02(j) which indicates that the motivation to combine references must come from the references themselves and not Applicant's disclosure. Even if it were proper to combine Vale and Han, they still would not provide the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 10. Claim 10 recites "storing any comments in association with the stored search results." Han was cited in the Office Action as teaching a method of identifying with comments a URL to be saved in a database. Applicant respectfully submits that this is distinguishable from storing comments associated with search results as recited in claim 10. Additionally, claim 10 depends indirectly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, claim 10 contains all of the features of claim 1. As previously discussed, Han adds nothing to the teachings of Vale so as to render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, claim 10 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 10 is respectfully solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han, claim 13 recites similar features to claim 5 discussed above. Additionally, claim 13 depends directly from independent claim 11. Because of this dependency, claim 13 contains all of the features of claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that Han adds nothing to the teachings of Vale so as to render independent claim 11 unpatentable. Therefore, claim 13 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, whether

considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 13 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han, claim 15 recites:

and
"presenting a dialogue box to enter comments related to any stored search results; and

storing any comments in association with the stored search results."

As previously discussed, Vale and Han do not teach or suggest search results obtained by a search by a search engine nor do Vale or Han teach or suggest presenting a dialogue box to enter comments related to any stored search results and storing any comments in association with the stored search results as provided by the embodiment of the present invention recited in claim 15. Additionally, claim 15 depends indirectly from independent claim 11, and by virtue of that dependency, contains all of the features of claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is also patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han, claim 18 recites features similar to claim 5, which patentably distinguish over Vale and Han as previously discussed. Additionally, claim 18 depends directly from claim 16, and because of that dependency, contains all of the features of independent claim 16. Applicant respectfully submits that Han adds nothing to the teachings of Vale so as to render claim 16 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is also patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of Section 103 rejection of claim 18 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Han, claim 21 recites features similar to claim 10, which as discussed above are patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han. Additionally, claim 21 depends indirectly from independent claim 16 and therefore contains all of the features of independent claim 16. Accordingly, claim 21 is also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han for

the same reasons as previously discussed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 21 is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 30 and 32, claim 30 recited features similar to claim 5 and claim 32 recites features similar to claim 15. As previously discussed, Han and Vale do not teach or suggest the features recited in these claims. Additionally, claims 30 and 32 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 28. Applicant respectfully submits that Han adds nothing to the teachings of Vale so as to render independent claim 28 unpatentable. Therefore, claims 30 and 32 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Vale and Han, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claims 30 and 32 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions about the present Amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels
(Applicant)

Date: December 19, 2006

By: Charles L. Moore

Charles L. Moore
Registration No. 33,742
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199